

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected.

Claims 1, 9, 18 and 19 are amended.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious in view of Baily, Baermann and Selman. Additional references are applied to reject claims 3 and 7. Additionally, Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 18-20 were rejected as being obvious in view of Postula, Baily, Baermann and Selman. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which is believed to overcome the prior art. More specifically, applicants have amended the claims in a manner which more clearly specifies the manner in which the present invention is non-obvious in view of the prior art, in that the invention achieves an unexpected result when compared to the combinations of the prior art. Applicants are able to achieve a unique placement for a display device by mounting the unit within the stationary cabinet unit in a location which is typically unusable for such an application. That is, applicants have provided a device that is of a generally thin profile to enable the device to fit within such a location, wherein the device may be securely mounted within the cabinet location. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references as cited do render the claims as presently amended to be obvious, since a unique and unexpected result is achieved by placement of the device within the location as claimed.

In addition, applicants' invention is further believed to be non-obvious in view of the prior art, since all of the limitations of the claims as amended are not taught by the combination of the cited prior art. That is, the Baermann reference is cited as teaching alternating polarities in order to align magnetic letters that

may be adhered to the surface of a magnetic page. (See, for example, Fig. 3.) However, as can be seen, Baermann does not teach single opposing polarities on either side of a page so that opposing pages of a device will magnetically adhere to one another as is claimed. Thus, the present invention is believed to be distinguishable in view of the prior art for at least the above reasons. Moreover, the Engel reference which was cited as being of interest, discloses magnetic tabs on differing pages so as to create a magnetic repulsion, which is contrary to the present invention.

With regard to Claim 15, applicants have further claimed an apparatus wherein the pages are formed in the shape of a character.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in the amended claims are non-obvious in view of the cited references since the claimed device and method as set forth in the amended claims achieve an unexpected result for the placement of a kitchen-cabinet type device as well as fulfilling a long felt need in the context of the kitchen cabinet industry. In addition, applicants respectfully submit that the suggestion and motivation to combine the large number of references in the manner described is not present in the prior art, even in of the recent changes in the case law.

Based on the above remarks and the amendments to the claims, applicants submit that the claims have been shown to be allowable in view of the prior art and that the basis for any rejections has been overcome.

35 US 112 Second paragraph Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended (what were) lines 11 and 13 to recite regions instead of portions in order to eliminate possible confusion.

35 US 112 First paragraph Rejections

Claim 8 was rejected as not being supported by the specification. Applicants have amended Claim 1, in order to recite that some of the sheets of planar material are magnetically adhereable to one another. In this way, all of

the sheets need not be magnetically adhereable. Support for the subject matter included in the amended claim can be found in Paragraph 25 of the published application.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the applicants' attorney at (908) 832-9498, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Please address all written correspondence to:

9 Cross Brook Drive
Califon, New Jersey 07830

Respectfully submitted,




Matthew J. Hodulik
Reg. No. 36,164

Dated: October 8, 2007

Certification of First Class Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any paper referred to as being transmitted therewith) is being deposited in the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope with sufficient postage addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on the date indicated below:

October 8, 2007
Date


Matthew J. Hodulik